

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6 and 7 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4, 6 and 7 are independent, and are amended herein.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,700,989 to Itoh et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Itoh").

As described in the Specification of the present application as filed, a "conventional MPEG decoder includes a large input buffer for converting the nearly constant bitrate of the MPEG bitstream." Specification at page 3, lines 3-4. With the presently claimed invention, "[b]y interchanging the order of inverse transform and accumulation, the variable-length decoding can be carried out at the input bitrate [with the] variable-length decoder [being] considerably simplified and the large input buffer can be dispensed with." Specification at page 3, lines 6-9. Thus, the claimed invention beneficially reverses the typical order employed during watermark detection (inverse transforming and then accumulating) with the claimed order of accumulating, and then inverse transforming. Thus, the present invention accumulates coefficients in the transform domain, and then inverse transforms the accumulated coefficients.

Applicants submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Itoh at least because claim 1 recites "accumulating spatially corresponding coefficients of a plurality of pictures of one frame of the video signal, wherein a picture is an array of pixels having the same size as the watermark," and "inverse transforming said accumulated coefficients into an accumulated plurality of pictures."

Itoh does not teach or suggest "accumulating spatially corresponding coefficients of a plurality of pictures of one frame of the video signal, wherein a picture is an array of pixels having the same size as the watermark," and then "inverse transforming said accumulated coefficients." Itoh merely describes a conventional method of inverse transforming a bitstream, where, as pointed out in the Office Action, "compressed data are expanded by an MPEG decoder 56." Itoh at column 29, lines 55-56. In conventional MPEG decoding systems such as that of Itoh, a compressed video signal (in the transform domain) is first inverse transformed (into the spatial domain), and then accumulated. In contrast, the recited invention of amended claim 1 first accumulates coefficients (in the transform domain), and then inverse transforms the accumulated coefficients (into the spatial domain). Thus, Itoh does not teach or suggest "accumulating spatially corresponding coefficients of a plurality of pictures of one frame of the video signal, wherein a picture is an array of pixels having the same size as the watermark," and "inverse transforming said accumulated coefficients into an accumulated plurality of pictures."

Accordingly, Itoh does not teach every element of claim 1 and is therefore not anticipated by Itoh for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Independent claims 4, 6 and 7 recite features similar to claim 1, and are therefore not anticipated by Itoh for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 4, 6 and 7 are in condition for allowance and request that the examiner withdraw those rejections.

Claims 2 and 3 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are therefore not anticipated by Itoh for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2 and 3 are in condition for allowance and request that the examiner withdraw those rejections.

Moreover, applicants submit that claim 2 is patentable over Itoh for additional reasons. For example, claim 2 recites a method wherein "accumulating coefficients is applied to the coefficients representing said residual pictures irrespective of coefficients representing the prediction picture." Applicants submit that Itoh does not describe "accumulating coefficients is applied to the coefficients representing said residual pictures irrespective of coefficients representing the prediction picture." Indeed, the portion of Itoh cited in the Office Action as being pertinent merely describes a method wherein "compressed data are expanded by an MPEG decoder 56." Itoh at column 29, lines 55-56. An algorithm of a conventional MPEG decoder such as that of Itoh makes use of coefficients representing a prediction picture when applied to a residual picture. In contrast, the recited method of claim 2 applies the coefficients representing the residual pictures irrespective of coefficients representing the prediction picture.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that for this additional reason, claim 2 is in condition for allowance and request that the examiner withdraw that rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the currently-pending claims are in condition for allowance and favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Im
Registration No. 50,418

Date: 21 October 2007

/ James Dobrow /
By: James Dobrow
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 46,666

Mail all correspondence to:

Paul Im, Registration No. 50,418
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9627
Fax: (914) 332-0615